



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that effect; the duty of inspection being an incident to the duty of maintaining the wire.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 15 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 661.]

3. Master and Servant (§ 125 (1)*)—Injuries to Servant—Duty of Master.—It is the duty of a mine operator to use reasonable care to make a fallen electric wire reasonably safe, after it knew, or by ordinary care might have known, of the defect.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 680.]

4. Master and Servant (§ 265 (14)*)—Injuries to Servant—Contributory Negligence—Burden of Proof.—The burden of proving contributory negligence is on the master, unless the servant's own negligence establishes it.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 723.]

Error to Circuit Court, Wise County.

Action by Asa Prophet's administrator, against the Virginia Iron, Coal & Coke Company. There was a judgment for plaintiff, and defendant brings error. Affirmed.

Bullitt & Chalkley, of Big Stone Gap, and *Jackson & Henson*, of Roanoke, for plaintiff in error.

Bond & Bruce and *Fulton & Vicars*, all of Wise, for defendant in error.

WADKINS v. DAMASCUS LUMBER CO.

Sept. 20, 1917.

[93 S. E. 591.]

1. Appeal and Error (§ 839 (2)*)—Review—Successive Trials.—It is the rule that, where there have been two trials, the appellate court must look first to the evidence and proceedings on the first trial.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 1 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 578.]

2. Appeal and Error (§ 839 (2)*)—Review—Successive Trials.—Where evidence upon each of two trials was identical, the latter verdict being the larger, evidence on the second trial alone will be considered on plaintiff's appeal, where defendant's demurrer to evidence was sustained, since, if there was no error to plaintiff's prejudice on the second trial, there could have been none on the first, and it was immaterial that there was a view of the premises by the jury on the first trial, and not on the second.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 1 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 578.]

3. Appeal and Error (§ 997 (2)*)—Review—Demurrer to Evidence.—Plaintiff's position being more favorable upon a demurrer to evi-

*For other cases see same topic and KEY-NUMBER in all Key-Numbered Digests and Indexes.

dence than upon a motion to set aside a verdict, the appellate court will only consider the action of the court upon the demurrer to evidence.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 1 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 576, 578.]

4. Master and Servant (§ 101, 102 (5)*)—Servant's Injury—Machinery—Custom and Usage.—An employer was not liable for his experienced servant's injury, sustained while tarring machinery, where machinery conformed to that in general use in similar plants, and the danger was incident to the work itself, rather than the failure to supply a safe place to work.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 674, 680.]

5. Master and Servant (§ 101, 102 (2)*)—Servant's Injury—Liability of Master in General.—Employers are not insurers of their employees safety, and are liable for the consequences, not of danger, but of negligence.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 674, 675.]

6. Master and Servant (§ 278 (20)*)—Servant's Injury—Duty to Warn—Sufficiency of Evidence.—Evidence held insufficient to show employer's duty to warn an experienced employee as to danger of tarring machinery; employee not having been directed to tar, but to oil, the machinery, and employee being aware of sticky quality of tar in cold weather, and dangerous character of machinery itself being perfectly obvious.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 725.]

7. Master and Servant (§ 88 (4)*)—Servant's Injury—Volunteers.—An employee, injured while tarring machinery, had no legal cause of complaint, where he was only directed to oil machinery.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 668.]

Error to Circuit Court, Washington County.

Action by John A. Wadkins against the Damascus Lumber Company. Judgment for defendant on demurrer to evidence, and plaintiff brings error. Affirmed.

L. P. Summers, of Abingdon, for plaintiff in error.

Hutton & Hutton and White, Penn & Penn, all of Abingdon, for defendant in error.

RINER *v.* LESTER.

Sept. 20, 1917.

[93 S. E. 594.]

1. Vendor and Purchaser (§ 166*)—Delivery and Acceptance—Effect.—If there was a valid delivery and acceptance of deed from

*For other cases see same topic and KEY-NUMBER in all Key-Numbered Digests and Indexes.